

they are still out there selling cigarettes. We know how many kids; 3,000 kids are starting smoking every day. The idea is get a trust fund, have those monies, the principal on your trust fund, work toward preventing that.

One of the most effective things that can be done is counteradvertising, and that is one of the recommendations that we were making. Go on television, go out with billboards, and any information you can give to the public about the dangers of smoking and try to target it to specific audiences and have it be relevant to those audiences.

After somebody gets addicted, they start when they are young, one of the next issues is how do you get them off. There are cessation programs. There are a variety of programs to help people wean themselves from cigarettes; and those could also be funded. Give people a chance to get themselves off of tobacco.

The thing that is deplorable to me is that many of the States have not taken this approach, have not headed down this road. New Mexico is not completely down this road either. They have taken the money and just let it flow into the general fund and spent on whatever comes up. Some States have taken the money and built roads.

This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. It is pretty rare that a State has a huge lump sum of money, anywhere from 5 to 6 to 1.2 or \$10 billion flowing into the State over 25 years. And if you are creative, inventive, you can really do, I think, some good things as far as public health and as far as our children.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Colorado we had that debate, and our Governor was very involved. If memory serves me right, we directed a significant amount of money into the very programs that have been created in New Mexico, and we have directed some into literacy programs and other programs which have been designated as worthy.

I have mixed feelings. I think a strong case could be made that all of the money ought to be used in the way the gentleman has suggested, where the principal is taken, and it generates a return, and all that can be done over a period of time is done to not only begin to reduce smoking, but eventually reach a point where none of our children start smoking at an age before they really understand the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, if an adult wants to utilize tobacco at some point, that is his or her right to do that. But as the gentleman points out, the statistics are staggering as to how many children start. They then carry that habit and addiction on into their adult years.

I was noting, too, the Attorney General mentioned that he had a concern that it would be a big government travesty to use the tragedy of tobacco as a smoke screen to cover the expansion of the nanny state.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would beg to differ with him, and I think many

Americans would, that this is an appropriate place for government regulation. This is an appropriate place for all of us through our government to come together and make sure that our children are not exposed to the great dangers of tobacco.

Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party, suggested that we do together through government what cannot be done solely as individuals.

It is clear that the power and the resources of the tobacco companies are enormous, and that the role that government can play in providing a counterbalance is crucial. Our free enterprise system provides for a lot of freedom, but it also asks corporations and large entities to act responsibly. I think that is the purpose at the heart of the litigation that has been brought, and I think that is again why I share the concerns that the Justice Department needs to look for a broader-based approach. It needs to involve other constituencies on a bipartisan basis in its pursuit of the important lawsuit that we have been discussing tonight.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, there are two important points here. Number one, get a new negotiator. There are plenty of former Attorneys General, there are State attorneys general, there are people in the government. The President should have another negotiator in place.

Secondly, how do you give credibility to this whole process? The process right now has a big cloud over it. There are serious questions that have arisen. I think involving the States attorneys general, a group of attorneys general that can come in and say, we are headed towards a settlement now, is this a good settlement. Then they can visit privately with the administration. Also in the end they should be able to make public pronouncements about the validity of the lawsuit, the size of the settlement, what was extracted in the settlement. There is no group in this country that knows more about what should be in a settlement than State attorneys general.

I would hope that not only would he remove Attorney General Ashcroft from this, but he would also focus on some independent oversight by State attorneys general. I certainly believe that with the combination of those two items, that we would be able to have a good outcome here.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would appeal to all of our colleagues in the House, all 435 of us, to weigh in with the President, request that he consider what I thought was a very thoughtful request on the part of the gentleman from New Mexico, and I think other colleagues would join the gentleman if they knew the extent to which this is an important issue facing us.

Mr. Speaker, it is an opportunity. It is arguably a health care crisis, but it also presents us with a real oppor-

tunity. I hope colleagues who have been here and have listened to our special order tonight would consider also making their own pitch to the President that this is a worthy undertaking and one that will be remembered not just in the near future if we do it right, but will be remembered for decades to come; that we got ahold of this public health problem and that we did something about it when it was appropriate and when our kids are really what are at risk here.

So I want to commend the gentleman for providing the leadership in this important area, and for after 8 years as attorney general and now 3 years in this body is continuing the good work on behalf of our children.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership on this issue and caring about our children in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I will say as we wrap up here that these are important issues to the American people.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for July 10 on account of illness.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 4:00 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of attending his son's wedding in Hungary.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WICKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SIMMONS, for 5 minutes, July 18.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PLATTS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 16, 2001, at 2 p.m.